

**REMARKS**

**Status Summary**

Claims 9-16 were previously pending in the application. By the Amendment, Claims 13, 14, and 16 are canceled without prejudice, new Claims 17-19 have been added, and Claims 9-12 and 15 remain unchanged.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that Claims 13, 14, and 16 include allowable subject matter. Allowable previously presented Claims 13, 14, and 16 have been cancelled and have been rewritten in independent form as new Claims 17, 18, and 19 to include all the limitations of the base claims. Therefore, new independent Claims 17, 18 and 19 are allowable.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The claims stand rejected over the cited prior art of record. Specifically, Claims 9-12 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,935,327).

In this regard, it is noted that independent Claim 9 recites a refrigerator which includes a body and a door pivotably fitted to the body. The body and the door jointly define an interior of the refrigerator. At least one lamp is provided having a light distribution for illuminating the interior. The lamp is mounted on the door and the light distribution relative to the door is variable and coupled to the pivoting movement of the door.

In a more specific aspect, as recited in Claim 10, the variable coupling and light distribution is achieved mechanically. Yet still further as set forth in Claim 11, the light

distribution has a direction (M) of highest - intensity emission which is pivoted in a direction opposite to the pivoting movement of the door. Yet still further as set forth in Claim 12, the transmission of the light distribution compensates for that of the door position at most angles of the pivoting movement of the door. Finally, as set forth in Claim 15, the refrigerator lamp has a light source and a refractive element which can be moved towards one another coupled to the pivoting movement of the door.

In making the rejection over Williams the Examiner has asserted that Williams discloses a device comprising a body, a door pivotably fitted to the body, with the body and the door jointly defining an interior, and at least one lamp mounted on the door for illumination of the interior. Further, the Examiner has also asserted that the light distribution relative to the door is variable and coupled to the pivoting movement of the door because of the movement of a shield. More specifically, the Examiner has indicated that the variable coupling is mechanical and has a direction of highest intensity that is provided in a direction opposite to the pivoting movement of the door such that the transmission ratio of the distribution compensates for the door position at most angles of the pivoting movement of the door, and the shield acts as a refractive element. In basing the rejection on Williams, the Examiner acknowledges that Williams does not disclose the device as a refrigerator but then analogizes that it is well known in the art to form refrigeration units as chests so that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the illumination unit disclosed by Williams to a refrigeration chest to illuminate the inside of the chest.

It is respectfully urged that in some aspects the characterization of the teachings of Williams is not correct and that Williams fails to render obvious the invention as recited in Claims 9-12 and 15. More specifically, reference is made to Williams in which the bulb shield is discussed as being operated on as a result of gravity, thus to be in a closed position when the lid is closed and in an open position when the lid is open to expose the illumination source and illuminate a cooking surface from above. The light

itself does not move variably as a result of the movement of the lid and instead is in a fixed position relative to the lid such that when the lid becomes completely open the light source is pointing directly downward on the grill surface of the grill. More specifically, the light bulb receptacle is secured to the lid through a threaded bolt arrangement in a fixed position (see Figure 4) in which it does not move relative to movement of the lid. In this regard, reference is made to column 5 in which is stated that a threaded bolt 418 secures the light bulb receptacle and the light enclosure to a receding receptacle 428 in the wiring portion 110b of handle 110.

The bulb shield referred to in Williams is not a refractive element and instead serves to protect and enclose the lamp and is preferably secured in a substantially closed position by a spring loaded release tab to prevent the bulb shield from rotating about the shield hinge when the lid is rotated to the open position, such that the shield is only released when it is desired to provide illumination (see column 5, lines 45-67). Thus, there is nothing in Williams which teaches or suggests a lamp mounted on the door and the light distribution relative to the door being variable and coupled to the pivoting movement of the door as is recited in Claim 9 of the present application.

Yet still further, there is no variable coupling of the light distribution in a mechanical manner as recited in Claim 10. In addition, the features of Claim 11 in which the light distribution has a direction of highest intensity emission which is pivoted in a direction opposite to the pivoting movement of the door is clearly not taught or suggested by Williams. As to Claim 12 there is no teaching of the transmission ratio of light distribution compensation for that of door position at most angles of movement. As to Claim 15, the shield is clearly not a refractive element and instead is a protective element which is intended to enclose the light source until the door or lid is opened into its maximum open position where the fixed position lamp then is pointed downwardly onto the grill surface.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that for these and other reasons, Williams does not teach or suggest the subject matter defined by independent Claim 9, and as further defined in dependent Claims 10-12 and 15 which depend from Claim 9.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, entry of the present Amendment and allowance of Claims 9-12, 15 and 17-19 are respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Respectfully submitted,



Craig J. Loest

Registration No. 48,557

August 14, 2007

BSH Home Appliances Corp.  
100 Bosch Blvd  
New Bern, NC 28562  
Phone: 252-672-7930  
Fax: 714-845-2807  
email: craig.loest@bshg.com